

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Princeton Review

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 5-4:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

(As per the on-site monitoring overview document, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Princeton Review's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Princeton Review
SITE: 1900 E Stop 12 Rd (Winchester Elementary)
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): S.B., L.S., and K.E.
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 3

DATE: 1-16-07
REVIEWER: ST, BM
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:45-5:30pm

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of "Satisfactory" (S) or "Unsatisfactory" (U) for each component. Providers receiving a "U" in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	S		Students worked in small groups with one tutor on the same lesson. Goals for each lesson were reviewed with students prior to the students beginning the lesson. Each lesson focused on reading. One group of students worked on comparing/contrasting and phonics exercises, and also completed workbook pages on an oral reading activity. A second group of students partner read the book "Eat My Dust" and shared one fact they'd learned from the book. In addition, this group completed an independent practice assignment on determining whether statements about the story they read were fact or fiction. A third group of students worked on reviewing the steps to categorizing items and applied this skill to an assignment on grouping/categorizing items from the book they were reading called "Tut's Mummy: Lost and Found". When students completed their assignments, tutors asked students to share their responses and guided students when they provided an incorrect answer. Observed lessons match original description in provider application.
Instruction is clear	S		Tutors provided clear directions that students were able to understand. Instruction was grade level appropriate. Tutors often provided students with examples to demonstrate a skill prior to encouraging students to complete independent practice assignments.
Time on task is appropriate	S		Students stayed on task and were attentive during each lesson. Students were very engaged in completing their assignments with little or no distractions.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	S		Tutors were familiar with the content of the assignments as evidenced by their ability to appropriately clarify instructions and adequately address questions posed by their students. Tutors used positive reinforcement to encourage students to answer questions even when students were hesitant to answer. Tutors also challenged student responses in a manner that encouraged higher level thinking.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>5-4:1</u>	S		Application notes that the ratio will be 12-8:1 and that instruction will be in small groups. A 5-4:1 ratio and small group instruction were observed.